



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/067,721	04/28/1998	TAKURO YAMAMOTO	P/3156-3	1544

7590

08/28/2002

Steven I Weisburd Esq
Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, NY 10036-2714

EXAMINER

SRIVASTAVA, VIVEK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2002

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
091067,721			

EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2611	15

DATE MAILED:

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- ☐ is extended to run _____ from the date of the Final Rejection
- ☐ continues to run _____ from the date of the Final Rejection
- ☒ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date that the shortened statutory period for response expires as set forth above.

- ☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).
- ☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 7/20/02, has been considered with the following affect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:
1. ☒ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
 - ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
 - ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
 - ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: The amended Limitation " Video data is sent to A system memory via A system bus and not through the Frame Buffer " would require further search and consideration


2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. ☒ Upon the filing of an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be ☒ will not be, entered and the status of the claims in this application would be as follows:
- Allowed claims: _____
- Claims objected to: _____
- Claims rejected: 1-14
- However:
- ☐ The rejection of claims _____ on references is deemed to be overcome by applicant's response.
 - ☐ The rejection of claims _____ on non-reference grounds only is deemed to be overcome by applicant's response.
4. ☐ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection.
5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.
- ☒ Other SEE ATTACHED

CHRIS GRANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

09/067,721- EXAMINER'S REMARKS TO RESPONSE

Applicant argues that the office action is defective with regards to claim 13 and claim 14. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's arguments. As admitted by Applicant's claim 13 recites "limitations relating to a video processor". The Examiner directs Applicant's to claim 2 lines 2 - 3 which recite "video data processed by a video processor". Claim 2 also recites a "video processor", as a result, the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Further, Applicant argues that claim 2 recites a system and claim 14 recites a method. The Examiner is some what confused why Applicant's feel claim 14 is defective. The Applicant's also failed to provide and reasoning why claim 14 is defective. In particular, the Examiner stated that claim 14 "recites similar limitations as claim 2 and is rejected under the same grounds as claim 2" but the Applicant's fail to provide any reasoning why this would be defective. As a result, the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.


CHRIS GRANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER